

City of Taylorsville  
Planning Commission Work Session  
Minutes  
Tuesday – August 23, 2005– 6:30 P.M.  
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

---

**Attendance:**

**Planning Commission**

Kristie Overson, Chair  
Ted Jensen  
Angelo Calacino  
Robert B. Daniels  
Blaine Smith  
Joan Rushton-Carlson

**Excused:** Dama Barbour

**Community Development Staff**

Mark McGrath, Director  
Michael Maloy, City Planner  
Nick Norris, City Planner  
Dan Udall, City Planner  
Jean Gallegos, Admin Assistant/Recorder

**PUBLIC :** Brooks Bradshaw, Carston McCullough, Brett Spencer, Mayor Janice Auger, Don Adams

[18:38:19](#)

**WELCOME:** Commissioner Overson welcomed those present, explained the procedures to be followed this evening, and opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

**CONDITIONAL USES**

- |  |
|--|
| 1. 29C05 <b><u>Carston McCullough-ElectroVision Signs, 4860 S. Redwood Road.</u></b><br>Electronic Message Center Sign. Dan Udall/City Planner (Preliminary) |
|--|

[18:39:10](#)

1.1 **Mr. Udall** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. The applicant is proposing a 3'10" x 18'10" electronic message center sign (72 square feet) at the Family Store Shopping Center. The applicant is proposing a new pole sign to be 30' high with a total face area of 252 square feet. The sign ordinance allows pole signs to be a total of 256 square feet. A portion of the sign is proposed to be an electronic message center sign. The property is 3.25 acres and is zoned C-2 (commercial). The applicant is proposing to remove four pole signs on the property. The pole sign is a permitted use without the electronic message center sign. **Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:**

1. That City Staff approves the final conditional use application.
2. That the pole sign is reviewed upon by complaint.
3. That the existing four pole signs on this property are removed.
4. That the pole sign is placed where it will not conflict with vehicle traffic.
5. **[Added by Motion] An appropriately maintained landscaping area be added below the sign.**

1.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Brooks Bradshaw** and **Carston McCullough.** [18:42:32](#) Applicants advised they plan to do a nicely landscaped area around the sign, including curbing. (Showed on the image which signs will be removed). The whole shopping center is being remodeled and the sign will match the remodeled areas, with all requirements being met. Applicants answered questions about possible distractions (passed out hand outs with pertinent information) and indicated that electronic message centers are a sign of the future. [18:45:10](#) **Commissioner Daniels** agreed, however, said that they are not completely safe and in some areas the brightness needs to be carefully controlled, along with their being the appropriate height and size for the particular area. He thanked the applicants for including the flower bed. [18:45:56](#) **Mr. Bradshaw** added that the client will be doing all the landscaping and that he had recommended to the applicant that the landscaped area be 3 to 4 feet in diameter.

1.3 **SPEAKING:** None.

1.4 **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AND OPENED TO THE COMMISSION FOR DISCUSSION OF A MOTION:** [18:47:17](#) **Commissioner Calacino** said that according to his calculations the sign would be 600 square feet, which is larger than a bill board. The addition of landscaping is a plus and he recommended that year around foliage be included along with that but the entire site needs to be brought into compliance and the four existing signs should be removed when this sign is installed.

- 1.5 **MOTION:** 18:49:49 Commissioner Daniels - I recommend preliminary approval of File 29C05 with the four conditions recommended by staff and add that appropriately maintained landscaping area be added below the sign.  
**SECOND:** Commissioner Calacino.  
Commissioner Overson stated the motion by Commissioner Daniels is to approve the application with staff's recommendations, adding #5 that there be a landscaped area around the bottom of the sign and that it is appropriately planted and maintained, with a second by Commissioner Calacino. 18:50:27  
**VOTE:** All Commissioners voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously.

2. 25C05 **Mr. Jack Lucas, Approximately 1300 W. Winchester Drive.** Conditional Use  
Permit to Construct a Single-Family Attached Residential Planned Unit  
Development Within an R-M Residential Zone. (Michael Maloy/City Planner)

18:50:47

2.1 **Mr. Maloy** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. Mr. Jack Lucas, Signature Development, has requested preliminary approval of a conditional use permit to develop 31 attached single-family residential units on approximately 3.09 acres of property located at 1276 W. Winchester St, 1286 W. Winchester St, 6615 S. 1300 W. and 6647 S. 1300 W. Due to site constraints and development objectives, the applicant has requested the project be permitted as a planned unit development (PUD) to allow flexibility in the application of zoning regulations. Previously this project has included the whole corner, however, they are now two separate developments (Signature Development and Prolifica). **Mr. Maloy** advised that the applicant is trying to make a strong architectural statement, however, staff feels it still needs pedestrian and sidewalk elements, along with usable open space. He added that the City is working on a trail system along 1300 West and would like a connection to this site. **Staff recommends preliminary approval with the following conditions:**

1. Receive approval from and remain compliant with all applicable reviewing agencies and departments of the City of Taylorsville (i.e., City Engineer, Uniform Fire Authority, Taylorsville-Bennion Improvement District, etc.).
2. Planning Commission shall review final conditional use permit application for planned unit development (PUD) to ensure compliance with all applicable zoning codes unless otherwise permitted by the PUD ordinance.
3. Applicant must combine existing lots into one parcel, compliant with City and County regulations.
4. Applicant shall provide an open space plan that creates positive, usable open space, and shall contain amenities compliant with staff comments contained within the staff report or as otherwise directed by the Planning Commission. Open space plan shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission for final approval.
5. Applicant shall coordinate with City staff a plan for all public and private improvements including streets, walkways and bicycle trails (if any). Infrastructure improvement plan shall address off-site improvements if required by the City Engineer. Planning Commission shall review plan for final approval.
6. Applicant shall provide an accurate, uniform street tree planting plan. Street trees should also account for location of street lights and fire hydrants.
7. Provide site lighting plan and with product specifications. Street light pattern should be equally staggered on both sides of the street and not linearly aligned on one side only. Concrete bases for street light poles should be minimally exposed.
8. Applicant shall submit for final approval a decorative sign plan compatible with site design and architecture.
9. For final review, provide a landscape plan designed by a professional landscape architect (or other experienced professional acceptable to staff). Landscape plan shall contain construction details, species type, locations, quantities and plant sizes. Applicant is required to select a mixture of plants to create a variety and "seasonal colors" within plant beds. As an important element of the required open space plan, landscape plan should represent an exceptional level in quality and address maintenance of open space.
10. All utilities shall be screened from primary views either by fences or densely planted vegetation. Roof located vent stacks are to be screened or carefully located to minimize negative impact. Rear or hidden locations are preferable to easily viewable locations from adjacent roadways.
11. Except for decorative lighting such as a porch light or garage lanterns, lighting should be downward cast or oriented toward building architecture. Lighting plans should not utilize simple utility or flood lights.

12. Applicant shall submit for final approval product specifications on architectural details such as exterior lighting including street lights, house numbers, mail boxes and as otherwise directed by the Planning Commission.
13. Preliminary material sample board should be refined for construction purposes prior to final approval; however, applicant shall maintain cement-based fibrous board or other similar paint able lapped board as a primary fascia element. Stucco or similar products should be used sparingly (if any) due to construction problems and long-term maintenance.
14. Main entry should be refined as a focal point of the front elevation. Exterior door and window details must be compatible with architectural design or vernacular.
15. Provide location, height and fence material specifications to be used in development for final approval by the Planning Commission.

2.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** Jack Lucas 19:07:03 Mr. Lucas introduced Mr. Wally Cooper to discuss the aspect of design and architecture, focusing on live able communities.

2.3 **Wally Cooper (Architect for Signature Development)** 19:07:40 emphasized that design is a process that involves many people and he asked that the Commission visit the site of another similar and very successful project called The Highlands Project, 5100 S. Highland Drive or one other in the Marmalade District near the State Capitol. 19:09:53 Ideas from both of those developments are being incorporated into this project. 19:10:33. One of their main goals is to bring people and homes closer together and to incorporate adequate green space in conjunction with the Prolifica development on the corner. 19:14:20 Discussion includes a trail throughout the project along the perimeter fence line. The design of these units will reduce the speed because the structures will be built closer to the street and will create a slower pace and feel of intimacy among residents.

- **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** 19:24:50 suggested putting sidewalks along just one side of the road and **Mr. Cooper** advised that would push the units back too far and impact setback distances. **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** asked what the attraction for buyers would be for this type project and **Mr. Lucas** said that the target group would be retirees and younger people for whom the usual stairs in these type developments might be a problem
- **Commissioner Calacino** 19:28:27 asked what the calculation was for net acreage and **Mr. Lucas** said that it would accommodate 33 units and they are projecting only 31 right now. **Commissioner Calacino** 19:29:10 then wanted to know the numbers which show open space. **Mr. Maloy** advised that 38% of the property shown on the engineering plan was open space. **Mr. Lucas** 19:29:55 added that in the R-M Zone for group dwellings, the requirement is for 25' common area for each unit.
- **Commissioner Jensen** 19:30:32 asked if there was going to be a home owner's association in place, to which Mr. Lucas replied there would be one similar to the one in Ivory Highlands. **Commissioner Jensen** asked about the proposed street lighting and **Mr. Cooper** said it would be patterned after those installed on Salt Lake City's avenues.
- **Commissioner Daniels** 19:33:16 commented that this appears to be a high density community with no gathering space included for people to meet or be drawn together. Not even a place for a home owner's association meeting to take place. He was concerned that people would naturally just keep to themselves under this situation and be unsocial with their neighbors. He also would like a walking trail included in the plan.
- **Commissioner Overson** 19:35:00 also expressed concern with identifying gathering places in the square on the corner, which is a different project. That the Commission is only looking at this project now and it needs to stand on its own. She was not certain that the stub to the north was appropriate and suggested instead to eliminate one unit there for a gathering place. Her main concern was that the two proposals work in harmony and felt that since the projects are being built separately that a lack of a fence on this one is a concern. She complimented the architect on the look of the proposed structures, however, suggested that the front doors be strengthened and more focus placed there than on the numerous garage doors.
- **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** 19:38:11 asked about porches and was advised by **Mr. Cooper** that wherever possible porches will be incorporated into the structure design. She then asked about the status of the Prolifica project on the corner and was informed by Mr. Lucas that they were anticipating preliminary or conceptual design to be ready for the first Planning Commission meeting in September.

## 2.3 **SPEAKING:**

- **Randall Anderson** (Lives directly east of the project). [19:41:33](#) **Mr. Anderson** had questions on the height of the buildings, depth of the rear yards and whether the community would be gated or not. **Mr. Cooper** advised him that the highest point would be 28', rear yards would be no less than 15' deep and the project would probably have a gate but would not be considered "gated" or controlled as such.
- **Mr. Maloy** [19:43:07](#) advised that City staff has discouraged a gated community for this project and would rather imply there is no through traffic allowed by curving the road to find a balance. **Mr. Cooper** [19:43:35](#) added that they did not wish to have the street cut through due to the narrowness of the street and closeness of the homes thereto. He indicated there would be a landscape island at the entrances.

2.4 **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AND OPENED TO THE COMMISSION FOR DISCUSSION OF A MOTION:**

**MOTION:** [19:48:05](#) **Commissioner Calacino** - I feel comfortable making a motion to grant preliminary approval on this proposed project, Application 25C05, based on the findings outlined in the Staff report and the conditions outlined by Staff. However, I believe that certain elements and other conditions need to be applied to this project. I will try to summarize. (1) To gauge this development, the first thing we need is what is the net acreage, once you subtract the dedication along 1300 West and Winchester and that will tell us what our acreage is to calculate the actual density. (2) That this development at least be gauged from the beginning point on the standards outlined as a dwelling group in the R-M Zone, which refers to open space, parking, minimum landscaping requirements, so forth. (3) That there is a centrally located common area to provide a gathering place for the community. At this point, I do not see that in this project, other than the detention basin in the southeast corner, which maybe could be expanded to two. We need a designated common area and I recommend that it not be less than at least 1,000 sq feet in area. (4) That there be a perimeter wall along the east and north property line and because they are proposing private streets, that it not connect to the north. That a decorative pre-cast concrete wall or equal be placed along 1300 West and Winchester and it be placed 5' back of property line to account for landscaping along the streetscape along with the landscaping in the park strips. That it be positioned so as not to interfere with clear view at the accesses. (5) That in regards to the private street, that this not be a gated community and that the street be no less than 25' to back of curb to back of curb. If the developer and home owner's association want to regulate on-street parking that is their business because they will have to deal with it because it is not a public street. I don't feel comfortable in regulating on-street parking. I would recommend, however, that they build 30' to back of curb and build to City standards so if it is ever turned over to the City, the City could accept it as being built to City standards. (6) Building setbacks – I don't believe the house portion should be any closer than 10' to the back of curb, the buildings should not be closer than 15' between structures on the sides and should not have a rear yard any less than 20'. I know the dwelling group allows 15' but I see 15' everyday on similar projects and it is too small. I would like to see this back to the Commission for final review with all other conditions outlined by Staff. One other recommendation is a minimum setback for driveways be 18' from back of curb to the front of the garage.

**DISCUSSION:** **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** - Commissioner Calacino, do you want to address anything about trails? **Commissioner Calacino** – I will comment that it would be an internal trail and if they want to design something internally, I would be happy with that. I don't know where it would go other than inside the development and I am real cautious about that because we don't even know if the other property is going to develop and I don't know where it would lead. I do believe this development needs to stand on its own and that is why it needs its' own common area and not leave it up to the other development to accommodate it all because no one knows when that portion will be coming in. The whole area may end up in Murray City eventually anyway.

**SECOND:** [19:53:37](#) **Commissioner Daniels** - Madam Chair, if the addition about the trail is a part of the motion, I will gladly second it.

**Commissioner Overson** - [19:53:47](#) We have a motion by Commissioner Calacino to grant preliminary approval of File 25C05 with Staff recommendations and also including that we need a figure regarding net acreage, would like to go by standards outlined in a dwelling group, that the common area is addressed to provide a gathering area of no less than 1,000 square feet; there should be a perimeter wall, however, it should not connect to the property on the north, the wall should be decorative pre-cast and on the street placed 5' back from the road, this not be a gated

community, the street should be no less than 25' side but encouraged to be 30' wide, the front yard setbacks be 10' minimum from back of curb to the main building, minimum 15' between buildings, 20' minimum rear yard, 18' minimum driveway and internal trails be somehow part of the conditions.

**VOTE:** All Commissioners voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously.

-----  
**MOTION:** Commissioner Calacino – I would make the motion to move Item #4 to #3 on the Agenda.

**Second:** Commissioner Jensen

**Vote:** All Commissioners voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously.  
-----  
--

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **Heard out of Agenda Order.**

3. Discussion of joint work session with the City Council. (Mark McGrath)
---

3.1 **Mr. McGrath** [20:32:27](#) opened this discussion with comments that there is a high level of frustration on the part of both the Planning Commission and City Council on how to get on the same page and recognize individual roles and responsibilities. He felt that the top priority was the need to discuss mutual respect for the General Plan and articulate the vision for the community. He felt the City Council did need some basic education relative to the rules and regulations which govern planning so that they can better understand from where the Planning Commission decisions are coming and the Commission needs to understand the mitigation and funding aspects which govern the City Council. [20:34:44](#). Another possible topic is the future role of the Board of Adjustment and how it impacts both the Commission and the City Council. Also appropriate conduct during open meetings. The item was opened up for discussion at this point:

- **Mayor Auger** advised that part of the reason the issue of conduct during open meetings came up was that she had people contact her about specific incidents that had occurred during an open meeting and she had also listened to two Planning Commission meetings. Up to that point she did not understand how at odds the two bodies really are. [20:40:41](#)
- **Mr. McGrath** [20:43:25](#) expressed that the main reason this item is on the agenda is to hear what issues are important and then to set up a meeting with the City Council Chair and the Mayor and then prepare the agenda for the joint meeting.
- **Commissioner Overson** [20:44:11](#) liked the idea of jointly discussing the roles and responsibilities for the Commission and the City Council. Planning Commission decisions are based differently than are the City Council's. She felt that education and training would be extremely helpful for Commissioners, especially those newly appointed. She felt it would be an asset to them to attend a few City Council meetings before assuming their Planning Commission role so that an effective comparison between the two could be made. Commissioner Overson wanted to emphasize the importance of the packets each body is given on a specific project be the same information.
- **Commissioner Daniels** [20:46:15](#) said his experience on the Salt Lake City Planning Commission was different than it is in Taylorsville. For one thing their regular meetings were held more than one a month and that the Commission met on a retreat at least once a year to share experiences, and which sessions were conducted by a trained facilitator. His suggestion was that the joint meetings with the City Council be held regularly in order to be more effective.
- **Commissioner Jensen** [20:48:01](#) was fully supportive of the joint meeting and felt it was a great opportunity to share ideas and visions and to look at long range planning issues. He also would like to discuss the form base zoning concept and the Jordan River Parkway issues.
- **Mayor Auger** [20:50:17](#) commented that every person who serves on the Planning Commission and the City Council do so because they care about the City. There can always be differences of opinion but it should never be personal and hoped the attitude going into the meeting would be positive. The next step is to meet with the City Council Chairman Wall and Councilman Pratt, establish an agenda and set up a time and place for the meeting.

- **Commissioner Overson** advised that the Commission would then await that decision.

#### **Heard out of Agenda Order**

4.1 **Mr. Maloy** oriented on the site plan. [19:56:52](#) He advised that Developer's Diversified Realty (DDR), has been working with the Economic Development Director for Taylorsville, Don Adams, on a new sign plan for the Family Center at MidValley. The sign plan proposal will result in new pylon signs for the entire project and will rename the shopping center, "The Family Center at Taylorsville." In initiating this signage change on this site, staff does not want it to affect all C-2 zoning, just for regional shopping centers over a certain amount of acreage. This sign package includes both the north and south phases for MidValley.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

- **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** [20:02:34](#) asked how many signs would be involved and **Mr. Maloy** advised it was about ten signs along Redwood Road between 5400 South and I-215. **Mr. Adams** [20:03:20](#) added that nine signs would be reconstructed and one additional sign would be added south of the Shopko Store. The majority of the signs would be in the exact same locations as they are presently.
- **Mayor Auger** [20:04:16](#) expressed satisfaction with the project as presented. The only point she wanted to add was that it would have been easier if it had been ready to implement along with the reconstruction of Redwood Road. For that reason, she reiterated that the City is somewhat under pressure to move this along carefully but timely. The intent of this proposal is not to set a precedent for all C-2 properties in Taylorsville but rather to rejuvenate this business district and add the landscaping at the I-215 exit/entrances.
- **Commissioner Jensen** [20:11:24](#) suggested that the Center's sign say "Family Center in Taylorsville" rather than "at" Taylorsville. **Mayor Auger** commented that DDR is considering changing the name to "Taylorsville Family Center", so the final decision has not been made.
- **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** asked how this proposal would affect the east side of Redwood and was advised by Mayor Auger that Wal-Mart has no strong concern with wanting any different signage. The proposal this evening is only for the west side of Redwood Road. [20:13:12](#)
- **Mr. Adams** [20:14:15](#) said that the possibility of establishing districts was in discussion, even though there are multiple tenants involved and City Staff has brought up the possibility of establishing an overlay for the zoning map to achieve this purpose. [20:15:06](#).
- **Commissioner Daniels** commented that it is important for communities to revitalize and was in favor of the overlay possibility to include the commercial community that might be considered later on. [20:15:33](#)
- **Mayor Auger** proposed that the Planning Commission hear this proposal in work session in September so that an ordinance can be passed by the City Council in preferably in October. [20:17:13](#) She felt it was important that City Staff work with DDR closely to achieve all goals in this effort and make sure everything is done correctly and timely.
- **Commissioner Calacino** [20:19:26](#) felt the overlay is needed for a couple of areas in the City. He added that the proposed signs are overly large and that with the lower speed limits, the signs don't need to be so high, only along I-215. He felt the signs should be limited to one per 300 lineal foot, that the extreme size of the signs should be looked at and that basic standards should be kept in place. [20:22:44](#)
- **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** asked how these new signs compared to what is presently there and **Mr. Maloy** advised that [20:24:49](#) the new signage is taller, has more area and there will be one additional sign.
- **Mr. Adams** [20:25:25](#) added that consideration must be given to the fact that this is a 30 year old center that is looking to gain a competitive edge. If the center was brand new or the developer's could tear it all down and re-plan a new center, there would not be a problem. The City needs to attract and obtain a slight edge. The developers and City are trying to create visual appeal to attract customers to come back. This facility has multiple tenants, all of whom are interested in attracting back the client base. The bottom line is that this is an outmoded center that is looking to create a new edge.

4.2 This item is on the agenda for discussion only and will be heard for recommendation to the City Council during the Planning Commission work session meeting to be held in September.

**ADJOURNMENT:** By motion of **Commissioner Daniels** and second by **Commissioner Smith**, the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by

---

Jean Gallegos, Administrative Assistant to the  
Planning Commission

Approved in meeting held November 8, 2005.